DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 334 939 HE 024 788

TITLE Testimony to the Senate Subcommittee on Education, Arts, and Humanities on the Reauthorization of the Higher Education Act.

INSTITUTION Congress of the U.S., Washington, D.C. Senate Subcommittee on Education, Arts and Humanities.

PUB DATE 21 Feb 91

NOTE 81p.; Testimony by Dr. K. Mohrman was not submitted and is not included.

PUB TYPE Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120) -- Legal/Legislative/Regulatory Materials (090)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS Competition; *Educational Legislation; Educational Technology; Employment Projections; *Federal Legislation; Hearings; *Higher Education; Human Capital; Job Skills; Labor Force; *Labor Force Development; *Labor Needs; Mathematics Curriculum; Nontraditional Students; Part Time Students; Science Curriculum; Service Occupations; Skilled Workers

IDENTIFIERS *Higher Education Act 1980; Reauthorization Legislation

ABSTRACT

This document contains the prepared statements of eight witnesses from the education, research, business, industry and university administration fields who were called to testify to the Senate Subcommittee on Education, Arts, and Humanities regarding the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act. Those witnesses and their subjects are: Reginald Wilson, from the American Council on Education, testifying on general issues regarding the current state of higher education in America; Arnold H. Packer, author of Workforce 2000, speaking on the changing nature of the nation's workforce and the economic impact of the skills gap; Thomas P. Solomon of the New England Council, whose subject was workforce training; Allan M. Norton of Martin Marietta describing that company's efforts to support math and science curriculums; Bernard Brown, representing the Coalition of Apparel Industries, speaking about domestic and foreign labor forces; John H. Zimmerman of MCI corporation, discussing work force skills and projected future trends for skill levels; Thomas Ehrlich, President of Indiana University, testifying on the large number of older, part-time, wage-earning undergraduates (with individual reports from the Chancellors of individual campuses); and Audrey C. Cohen, President of The College for Human Services, giving his assessment of the increasing technologization of education and the increased interdependence and service orientation of the world at large. (JB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED334939

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, ARTS AND HUMANITIES
WITNESS LIST

Hearing: Thursday, February 21, 1991
10:00 a.m., SD-430
Subject: American Higher Education and the Future

PANEL I

Dr. Reginald Wilson
Senior Scholar
American Council on Education

Dr. Arnold Packer
Co-Author
Workforce 2000

PANEL II

Honorable Thomas P. Salmon
Former Governor of Vermont
Chairman, New England Council

Mr. Allan M. Norton
President
Martin Marietta Electronics,
Information & Missiles Group

Mr. Bernard Z. Brown
President
Coalition of Apparel Industries

Mr. John Zimmerman
Senior Vice President
MCI Communications

PANEL III

Mr. Thomas Ehrlich
President
Indiana University System

Dr. Audrey C. Cohen
President and Founder
The College for Human Services

Dr. Kathryn Mohrman
Dean for Undergraduate Studies
University of Maryland
at College Park

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

HE 024 788

Testimony to the
Senate Subcommittee on Education, Arts, and Humanities

on the
REAUTHORIZATION OF THE HIGHER EDUCATION ACT
February 21, 1991

Reginald Wilson, Ph.D.
Senior Scholar
American Council on Education
Washington, DC

Subcommittee on Education,
Arts, and Humanities
February 21, 1991

Reginald Wilson
American Council on Education

HEARING ON THE REAUTHORIZATION OF THE HIGHER EDUCATION ACT

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is Reginald Wilson. I am Senior Scholar in the office of the President at the American Council on Education (ACE). ACE is the premier higher education association in the nation, and represents the interests of its nearly two thousand member colleges and universities as well as those of the other higher education associations representing particular constituencies of two year, four year, public and private collegiate institutions. ACE has played a leading role since 1918 in bringing the collective concerns of the higher education community to the Congress, to the Executive Administration, and to the public at large. At this initial hearing we want to address some general issues regarding our perspective on the current state of higher education in America, stressing some concerns we believe the Congress should address in its deliberations on reauthorization, while recognizing that more specific legislative issues will be more appropriately addressed on subsequent occasions.

In 1987, ACE, in collaboration with the Education Commission of the States established a national Commission on Minority Participation in Education and American Life. We were honored to have the former United States presidents, Gerald Ford and Jimmy Carter, serve as honorary co-chairs of the commission. Thirty-seven other distinguished Americans joined them on the commission including governors, mayors, university presidents, CEOs of major corporations, and heads of major civic organizations. ACE established that national commission out of its concern regarding the crisis of lost momentum in the nation's attempt to achieve equal opportunity in education for all our citizens and the consequent lack of equal participation in the civic and economic life of our country, and

what these circumstances portended for the continued viability of American society.

After some months of deliberation, the commission issued its report, entitled One-Third of a Nation, which began with these words:

> America is moving backward -- not forward -- in its efforts to achieve full participation of minority citizens in the life and prosperity of the nation... If we allow these disparities to continue, the United States inevitably will suffer a compromised quality of life and a lower standard of living. Social conflict will intensify. Our ability to compete in world markets will decline, our domestic economy will falter, our national security will be endangered. In brief, we will find ourselves unable to fulfill the promise of the American dream.

Three years later, we find the prophecy of those words to be still essentially correct, which the most recent data from our Annual Status Report corroborates. Despite recent increases in enrollment, the college participation rates of African Americans, Latinos and American Indians lags considerably behind that of majority Americans and, indeed, those participation rates are lower today than they were fifteen years ago. For example, 18 to 24 year-old African Americans were participating in college at 34 percent of that cohort in 1976 and their rate is now below 30 percent with the lowest rate being that of African American males. For Latinos, their rate was 35 percent in 1976 and is now 28 percent. American Indians have never risen to even 20 percent in college participation of high school graduates. Although in aggregate Asian college participation rates seem quite high, when you disaggregate the Asian group, you find recent immigrants such as Cambodians, Thai and Laotians, with high school graduation and college participation rates even lower than those of other minority groups.

At the graduate level, African Americans particularly are showing distressing declines. During the past decade they declined 32 percent in the acquisition of master's degrees and 21 percent in doctorates. Hispanics and American Indians, despite gains, are still considerably underrepresented in

graduate school enrollments and in degrees received. Indeed, it should be noted that there was also a decline of 10 percent in white male graduate school enrollments as well. Moreover, 50 percent of mathematics doctorates, 45 percent of engineering doctorates and 30 percent of science doctorates from American universities have gone to foreign students in recent years.

Even given the concern with under-enrollment, we find that less than two-thirds of majority students complete a baccalaureate degree in six years of undergraduate study, while only a third of African American and Latino students manage to do so. Thus, our concern is not only with under-enrollment but is with retention and success in degree attainment as well.

Additional studies indicate to us that the socioeconomic circumstances of our poorest minorities has worsened during the past decade, with more falling below the poverty line than before. This means that, independent of other factors, our poorest citizens are economically less able to afford college, where tuitions are rapidly rising, than in the past.

Demographic studies indicate that with a combination of high birthrates and immigration, shortly after the year 2000, minorities will comprise one-third of the American population and nearly 40 percent of the students in public school. Women and minorities will constitute the majority of persons in the college age cohort. More older, married and part-time students will be attending colleges. Unless our institutions adapt to the new reality that those we call "non-traditional" students will be the norm for the forseeable future, we will not only inefficiently expend our educational resources but we will leave large segments of our rapidly changing population poorly educated.

At the Annual Meeting of ACE, January 15-18, 1991, in San Francisco, two of our keynote speakers, Louis Harris the pollster and Marc Tucker, President of the National Center on Education and the Economy, stressed the same theme: if the United States is to regain its competitive edge in the world economy, it must educate more and it must educate

smarter. Yet, as we compare our per capita spending on elementary and secondary education with other industrial nations, we are near the bottom of the list. And when we compare the academic achievement of our students with other countries we are even below some non-industrialized countries. And, certainly, as has been described, both the participation rate and the graduation rate of our college students leaves much to be improved. Arguably the United States has the finest higher education system in the world and a higher participation in it of our citizens. Yet many of our citizens do not have equal access to this system and our overall quality of achievement is considerably variable with many students left unprepared for careers. While much of our secondary education is geared for the college-bound, those who are not going on to college are poorly prepared for the world of work. As a result our corporations spend over $5 billion a year in training and retraining programs for ill-prepared or underprepared workers.

The continuation of such an inefficient educational system and its consequent lowered quality of life cannot be allowed to continue, both for the future viability of our individual disadvantaged citizens and, indeed, for the future well-being of the nation as a competitive economy, and as a nation where equal opportunity, participation, and social justice are enjoyed by all its citizens.

In our report, <u>One-Third of a Nation</u>, we concluded:

> All segments of our society -- public officials and private citizens; government, business and non-profit institutions; moderates, conservatives and liberals -- must commit themselves to overcoming the current inertia and removing, once and for all, the remaining barriers to full participation by the emerging one-third of the nation -- minority citizens -- in education and all other aspects of American life.

More particularly, the Quality Education for Minorities Project (QEM) states in its most recent report: "By the year 2000, we believe it is possible to have in place an educational system that will deliver quality education to minority youth." They go on to assert, "It is important to be

clear that minority Americans do not seek the same level of educational opportunity now enjoyed by most White children: we seek more, and for all students." Certainly such a goal is in keeping with our expressed desire that the total efficiency and opportunity of our educational system from preschool to graduate school must be improved for the benefit of all students and for the benefit of the nation as a whole.

The QEM report goes on to state certain basic goals, with which we concur, for the attainment of its objectives:

1. All students must start school prepared to learn.

2. Academic achievement must enable students upon graduation from high school to be able to enter the workforce or go to college.

3. Minority students must be increased in higher education participation with emphasis on mathematics and science.

4. Minority teachers and minority professors must be increased.

5. The school-to-work transition must be strengthened for students who do not choose to go to college.

6. Quality out-of-school educational experiences must be provided as well as community service projects.

The American Council on Education recognizes that some exemplary programs currently exist at a number of institutions that have significantly improved minority participation at all levels:

- The University of Michigan has significantly increased minority faculty hiring as well as undergraduate and graduate student enrollment.

- LaGuardia Community College (NY) has a model 2 year to 4 year college transfer program.

- o The Florida Endowment Fund has significantly increased black attainment of Ph.D. degrees.

Our concern is that these programs are not sufficiently widespread, comprehensive or nationally supported enough to significantly affect the overall declining participation rates or the attrition rates that we document in the earlier parts of this testimony.

To reverse those trends will require national as well as state and institutional efforts of a substantial nature to attain the ambitious goals that we believe this nation is capable of:

1. A significant increase in Federal student aid grants.

2. Support for minority graduate fellowships and scholarships.

3. Increased support to historically black colleges, Hispanic colleges and Native American tribal colleges.

4. Funding of model college programs that increase minority participation and graduation.

5. Demonstration grants for innovative teaching-learning strategies and programs.

6. Funding for exemplary school-to-work and 2 year to 4 year transition programs.

The American Council on Education believes that such federal initiatives will contribute enormously to energizing the education community and provide national leadership for the full and effective participation of all citizens in the educational enterprise to the ultimate benefit of the nation, its citizens and our social and economic future.

Thank you for the opportunity of allowing me to share my views with the committee.

STATEMENT OF ARNOLD H. PACKER
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
SECRETARY'S COMMISSION ON ACHIEVING NECESSARY SKILLS
BEFORE THE
SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, ARTS, AND HUMANITIES
COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES
UNITED STATES SENATE

February 21, 1991

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee:

This morning I would like to talk to you briefly about the changing nature of the nation's workforce, the economic impact of the skills gap, and how these issues relate to the important work you will be doing when you reauthorize the Higher Education Act.

Nearly four years ago, as a senior fellow of the Hudson Institute, I co-authored, with Bill Johnston, the report entitled Workforce 2000: Work and Workers for the 21st Century. Commissioned by the Department of Labor, this study documented that the skills gap is constraining economic growth in the United States.

The bottom line of Workforce 2000 is that our economic future depends on improving "the educational preparation of all workers." But the 1990s present some special challenges that make this task more difficult.

Rapidly-changing technologies can make jobs obsolete overnight. A globally-linked economy will produce unexpected changes that can quickly dislocate businesses and workers. We must be prepared to respond to these changes.

At the same time, Workforce 2000 documented important demographic facts about the coming changes in the workforce.

- Over the next decade, the American workforce is projected to grow at the slowest rate since the 1930s. A workforce that grew by 24 million people in the 1970s is projected to grow by less than 16 million in the 1990s. One conclusion that could be drawn is that employers will no longer be able to skim the most highly-skilled workers off the top and ignore the rest. They will need to rely on all workers to fill jobs demanding sophisticated skills.
- The average age of the population and the workforce is projected to rise and, correspondingly, the pool of young workers will shrink. The average age of the workforce will rise from 36 to 39 by the year 2000. There are some positive benefits to an older workforce, because it gives you more experienced and reliable workers. On the other hand, older workers are less likely to move, change occupations, or participate in retraining than younger workers. And companies that have grown by adding many lower-paid young workers will find them in short supply.
- New entrants into the workforce will increasingly be women, minorities, and immigrants, many of whom have been poorly served by the current system of education and training. They will comprise a substantial proportion of the new additions to the workforce by the year 2000 (that is, new entrants minus retirees).

Immigrants, for example, will make up the largest share of the increase in the workforce since World War I. However, the Immigration Act of 1990 is expected to increase the number and percentage of highly skilled immigrant workers.

Along with these changes in the composition of the workforce there will be rapid changes in the nature of the job market. The fastest-growing jobs are projected to be in professional, technical, and sales fields. They will require higher education and skill levels.

In research subsequent to the Workforce 2000 project, Bill Johnston and I compared the skills that will be demanded by a healthy U.S. economy in the year 2000 with the skills of today's young people, those age 21-25. We estimated that closing the gap would require upgrading the skills of 25 million workers in the 1990s. Using a U.S. Department of Labor scale, we found that the U.S. will need to improve the skills of those workers by 38 percent.

More than half of the gap is due to increasing demands of the new workplace. As I said earlier, there will be fewer lower-skilled jobs in the years ahead if, and I emphasize if, we are going to improve productivity in the United States.

I am concerned that the current education and training system will neither keep the United States competitive in the global marketplace nor provide a rising standard of living here at home. I am convinced that the entire system -- from pre-

school toddlers to graduate education and continuing education for mature people who are already in the workforce -- needs to be improved.

To help achieve this goal, last spring former Secretary of Labor Elizabeth Dole created the Secretary's Commission on Achieving Necessary Skills, or what we call SCANS. The panel is chaired by former Senator and Secretary of Labor William E. Brock. It is composed of 31 commissioners, all of whom are leaders from business, education, labor and government. I have submitted a copy of our mission statement and a list of the SCANS commissioners for the record. I would note that because the Commission is in the process of preparing its final report, it would be premature for me to discuss the specifics of any particular recommendations that the commissioners may consider.

The work of the Commission is intended to encourage major improvements in the way schools prepare students for productive work and the way employers use the talents of highly-skilled workers. To begin, we are now working to identify specific skills that all American workers should possess by the age of 16. We picked that point because that is when many students are lost when they drop out of school.

The skills we are talking about are not just the obvious ones, such as proficiency in reading, writing, and math. They will probably include more complex skills, such as the ability to communicate, use technology, and work in groups.

Next we will identify ways to teach these skills and encourage schools to use these teaching methods. We will also define effective ways to assess whether an individual has attained these skills.

But how does SCANS relate to your concerns about the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act? Clearly, an important part of our mission is to encourage major improvements in elementary and secondary schools, the essential foundation for building a better workforce. But achieving a world-class workforce will require more.

It will require ensuring that minorities and disadvantaged Americans have the opportunity to pursue a postsecondary education. And it will require that we provide educational opportunities to the vast majority of people who will not get a traditional, four-year college degree.

The recent influential report by the Grant Commission refers to the non-college-bound students as "the forgotten half." It is this significant and important segment of the population that has experienced the greatest loss of income.

Many postsecondary programs, which will be affected by your revisions in the Higher Education Act, can play an important part. These include community colleges and private career and trade schools. These kinds of institutions not only impart the acquisition of basic skills, but also the technical, job-specific training many of today's and tomorrow's jobs require.

Upgrading the skills of the current members of the American workforce is important because three-fourths of the members of the year 2000's workforce are already working today. Continuing education and retraining by corporations and unions should continue to be an integral part of the American adult experience. Small and medium-sized companies that wish to upgrade their workforces may benefit from partnerships with a variety of postsecondary institutions.

I am convinced that improving the skills of the American workforce is one of the paramount challenges of the 1990s. Consequently, I applaud the fact that you are beginning your hearings on the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act by examining these essential workforce issues.

Certainly, a centerpiece of your work should reflect the nation's need to upgrade the skills of its workers. Our success in meeting this goal promises to improve our ability to compete in the global marketplace and to provide more meaningful employment, greater career opportunities, and a better standard of living for all Americans.

Thank you for the opportunity to participate in this hearing today. I would be happy to answer any questions you might have.

The New England Council, Inc.

581 Boylston Street Boston, Massachusetts 02116 (617) 437-0304 • 1455 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., Suite 1000 Washington, D.C. 20004 (202) 639-8955

TESTIMONY OF

HON. THOMAS P. SALMON, CHAIRMAN

NEW ENGLAND COUNCIL, INC.

ON THE

REAUTHORIZATION OF THE HIGHER EDUCATION ACT

BEFORE THE

SENATE LABOR & HUMAN RESOURCES

SUBCOMMITTEE ON

EDUCATION, ARTS AND HUMANITIES

FEBRUARY 21, 1991

Mr. Chairman, members of the Subcommittee on Education, Arts and Humanities, I am Tom Salmon, Chairman of the New England Council, the nation's oldest regional business organization. I am pleased to join you today to share my thoughts on workforce training and the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act.

As a former Governor of the State of Vermont, Chairman of the Green Mountain Power Corporation and now head of the New England Council, I am able to offer insight gained from over three decades in public and private service. Throughout my career in both sectors I have been mindful of the important role education, particularly higher education, has played in the economic growth of our region and nation.

Last year, in an effort to contribute to New England's economic recovery, I formed a special commission of the region's foremost corporate, financial and academic leaders to develop policy options for our region's elected officials and appointed policy makers. Among the top priorities identified by this panel of experts was a reaffirmation of our commitment to higher education, student preparation and university-sponsored research. The panel's specific policy recommendations will be released this spring.

Background

New England's public schools and institutions of higher education have traditionally played an important role in providing the region's businesses with the best trained and skilled workforce found in the nation. The link between economic growth and quality education has always been a critical element in the region's economic success. The importance of this linkage was most evident during the 1980s, when technology-based industries led the region through a period of unprecedented expansion and prosperity.

As the region recovers from an economic downturn, the New England Council, representing the region's business community, is mindful of the relationship between education and economic development and realizes that prosperity will be based on sound educational policies and healthy learning institutions.

Educational systems and institutions will confront severe challenges in the 1990s. Only with farsighted federal and state policies will the region sustain and expand its skilled human resources and meet the levels of productivity demanded by global competition. The strategic interests of education at all levels - primary, secondary and post-secondary - and corporate New England must converge to insure economic revitalization. This convergence must include support for:

- upgrading the quality of public school education;
- improving partnerships between colleges, universities, businesses and public school systems;
- increasing the participation rate of adult men and women, particularly minorities, in responsive continuing-education and retraining programs;
- enhanced basic and applied research and technology transfer at our colleges and universities;
- creation of state incentives improving the commercialization of research and development through university-industry partnerships; and
- development of a coherent training policy to meet the acute shortages of scientific, engineering, and other highly skilled personnel.

Higher Education

New England has a larger concentration of institutions of higher education than any other region in the country, including private, public two- and four-year institutions, community colleges and a variety of vocational and technical schools. Higher education in New England represents an estimated $12 billion contribution to the gross regional product. Its indirect impact on the regional economy accounts for close to $30 billion each year.

The extraordinary concentration of R&D excellence in New England has been the basis for attracting able students and retaining superb faculty since World War II. Investment in higher education and academic R&D has provided real long-term return in New England and is the key to sustained growth and development.

Quality higher education is the crucial factor in the knowledge-intensive New England economy. As international competition intensifies, New England's economy will require that knowledge be applied more rapidly to the solution of technical, economic and social problems. If we are to meet that challenge, we must strengthen our institutions of higher education and support the students attending our colleges and universities.

Each year, approximately $1 billion of federal Title IV aid benefits more than 200,000 students attending higher education institutions in New England. The Council believes reauthorization of the Higher Education Act of 1965 is of fundamental importance to the New England economy. Seventy

percent of all students in postsecondary institutions in the region receive some form of federal student aid, either through the Pell Grant program, Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grants, Guaranteed Student Loans including Stafford loans, PLUS loans for parents, Supplementary Loans for Students (SLS), or through a variety of federally sponsored campus-based aid programs.

Pell Grants

Regional economic prosperity depends on the broadest level of individual access to a quality postsecondary education. Pell grants provided $136 million to New England students during the 1988-89 academic year. Young people from low income families in New England rely on this assistance and need a substantial increase in Pell grants and Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grants (SEOG) to insure continued access to higher education. The New England Council urges Congress to maintain the strongest possible commitment to the Pell Grant program.

In addition, the Council urges Congress to require that Pell grants be applied to the costs of education before additional educational funds are utilized. This targeting of grant funds will ensure that those who take advantage of loan programs will do so only after they have demonstrated academic progress and a capacity to stay in school.

Federally Guaranteed Loan Programs

Federal student loan programs have become the largest source of federal assistance to students in New England and the rest of the nation. The Stafford, PLUS and SLS loan programs are an important component in over 50 percent of student financial aid packages. In their administration, the federal loan programs represent a partnership including state government grant programs, not-for-profit student loan guarantors, secondary markets and hundreds of lending institutions. Nationally, federal guarantees have made available over $100 billion in student loan dollars since 1965. I wish to remind members of the Subcommittee that since these loans have been made available, the New England region has consistently maintained the lowest student loan default rate of any other area of the country.

As college costs outpace the level of assistance available through federal student aid programs, federally guaranteed loan programs should be expanded for parents and upper-division undergraduate and graduate students. The maximum annual loan amounts for Parent Loans for Undergraduate Students (PLUS loans) should be increased to

$20,000 per year. The maximum loan amounts for the Stafford loan program should be held constant at $2,625 per year for first-year undergraduates, but increased to $4,000 for second-year borrowers and $6,000 for third, fourth and fifth year borrowers, as recommended by the National Association of Financial Aid Officers. Graduate students should have access to at least $10,000 in guaranteed loan assistance and, by 1996, up to $12,000 in loan funds. The Supplemental Loans for Students (SLS) program annual loan limits should be increased to $4,000 for first- and second-year students, $6,000 for third and fourth year students and $10,00 for graduate students.

By maintaining lower loan limits during the first and second years, Congress can lower the level of borrowing during the periods when the risk of dropout, withdrawal and default are the highest. Over 75 percent of all student loan defaults occur during the first year of an undergraduate experience. Maintaining lower limits in the early periods of education reduces the default cost to the federal government.

Additional strategies to reduce default rates and default costs must be developed. State initiatives including tax refund offset programs, denial of professional licenses and wage garnishment should be encouraged by the federal government. Strong loan counseling and education debt management assistance should be provided at the school level to encourage responsible student loan borrowing.

The Council strongly supports the continuation of existing financing mechanisms in federally guaranteed loan programs, which leverage approximately $12 billion annually from lenders of all sizes including credit unions and community banks.

Proposals to eliminate the banking sector from education loan programs and centralize the direction and activity of such activities within the federal government could create management and logistical difficulties for the U.S. Department of Education. Thousands of postsecondary institutions are unprepared for a doubling or tripling of their administrative burden and responsibilities in federal financial aid programs.

Needs Analysis

The Council strongly recommends the incorporation of regional economic factors into the "needs analysis" systems used to determine eligibility for federal aid programs.

Using flat and static income levels and including home equity within the calculations substantially reduces the eligibility of New England students for Pell grants and Stafford loans. For example, a student from a Boston area family with identical income (adjusted for regional differences in cost of living indices) to a family from Kansas City would have a Parental Contribution (PC) of $5,871 compared to the student from the Kansas City family who would have a PC of $2,945.

Financial Aid Information and Awareness Programs

The U.S. General Accounting Office revealed in a June, 1990 report to the U.S. Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources that students and their families know "surprisingly little" about financial aid for higher education and its availability. A 1988 series of interviews of high school seniors found only a "rudimentary notion" about the availability of financial assistance programs for postsecondary education.

Outreach programs designed to inform young people and their families about opportunities in postsecondary education and financial assistance can meet and defeat this information gap in knowledge about school costs and federal aid. Programs such as Rhode Island's Crusade for Children and New York's Liberty Scholarships should also be encouraged.

Programs of access to higher education should include a major expansion of Talent Search, Upward Bound, and Educational Opportunity Centers, as well as special services to low-income students to make retention in and completion of college more likely. The federal government should stimulate, in concert with regional business-education partnerships, early awareness and information counseling programs for high school and even middle school students and their parents.

One of the keys to access to higher education is a variety of information on counseling programs available regionally and locally. Programs in Massachusetts and Vermont have achieved success in acquainting citizens in New England with the ways and means to secure opportunities in postsecondary education.

Thank you for this opportunity to present the New England Council's views and recommendations on the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act. As the members of this Subcommittee review this legislation and take action to strengthen its important programs, I assure you that the members of the New England Council stand ready to assist you in any way possible.

Testimony

on

The Higher Education Act Reauthorization

Allan M. Norton
President
Martin Marietta
Electronics, Information & Missiles Group

before the

Subcommittee on Education, Arts and Humanities
Committee on Labor and Human Resources
U.S. Senate

February 21, 1991

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am Allan M. Norton, president of Martin Marietta Electronics, Information & Missiles Group, which employs more than 10,000 in Central Florida.

It is indeed a pleasure to appear before you today to talk about a subject of extreme importance to Martin Marietta, and to me personally -- education.

The Martin Marietta Corporation is committed to improving the quality of education in those communities where its employees live and work. Across America, we are giving time, energy and money to educational institutions at all levels. Our efforts are primarily directed at improving and enhancing math and science curriculums.

Our training partnership with Valencia Community College is an example of a model that we believe Congress can use as it rewrites the Higher Education Act.

Specifically, years ago our training staff analyzed the workforce training needs in order to establish a world class "paperless factory." This factory uses computer technology to make our operations highly efficient and to maximize product quality.

Valencia responded by working with our engineers to custom design a 40-course high tech educational program.

A federal grant is assisting in offering that program to nearly 700 employees.

Also, Valencia's computer literacy courses enable our workers to more effectively use our 6,300 computers.

The Valencia staff and faculty have become an extension of our own company staff, and we rely upon them as we would our own employees.

We have invested many millions of dollars in the equipment and processes that support our R&D and manufacturing programs, yet this investment means little unless our employees are properly trained.

Also, the quality of our vendors' products is improved through Valencia training.

These specific training programs are but one part of a multi-faceted partnership between Valencia and Martin Marietta. Other relationships are:

o Martin Marietta employees serving as Valencia adjunct faculty,

o Martin Marietta facilities supporting instruction,

o Company professionals serving on advisory committees,

o Martin Marietta engineers assisting in curriculum updating,

o Sponsorship of business and industry seminars at Valencia,

o Assistance in establishing a Technology Transfer Center at Valencia,

o Financial support in establishing a $75,000 endowed chair in mathematics at Valencia,

o And our employees support for a Valencia scholarship fund.

Federal funds strengthened this model partnership. One measure of its strength and quality is receipt of the 1990 U.S. Secretary of Education Outstanding Vocational Program Award by Valencia.

We urge continued support for college and private sector partnerships that enable students to progress smoothly and be retained.

Student success is critical to companies like Martin Marietta that need engineers and scientists, and whose employees need skill upgrading as technology progresses.

We are grateful to Congress for its special support for community college participation in Title III of the Higher Education Act, and urge you to allow colleges like Valencia that have successfully used these funds to continue to participate in Title III.

Martin Marietta's ability to prosper in tomorrow's challenging environment will be decided by a dedicated and highly skilled workforce where high quality training programs are critical to our continued success.

It has been a pleasure to appear before this committee. Thank you.

TESTIMONY OF

COALITION OF APPAREL INDUSTRIES

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES

UNITED STATES SENATE

PRESENTED BY

BERNARD Z. BROWN

PRESIDENT, COALITION OF APPAREL INDUSTRIES

FEBRUARY 21, 1991

Good morning Senator Pell and distinguished members of the Subcommittee on Education, Arts and the Humanities. I am Bernard Brown and I am pleased to have the opportunity to appear before you to discuss educational access and opportunity and the status of the American workforce and international competitiveness. I've been associated with the apparel profession for 42 years as an executive with Koret of California and Levi Strauss which have combined revenues of over $4 billion a year.

I am President of the Coalition of Apparel Industries, an industry which represents a total value of apparel manufactured in the United States that is close to 73 billion dollars, this does not include domestic textile, which is 17 billion. Number of employees in the apparel manufacturing is 1,900,000.

I must also mention in retail trade, the general manufacturing field, there are 2,590,000 employees, out of that 1,119,000 work in apparel specialty stores.

Retail sales in general merchandising stores is 210 billion. In apparel alone 94.3 billion. This includes domestic as well as imports.

The apparel, manufacturing and retail industries offer multidimensional career opportunities. Many people believe that when one sees a garment in a store that the name or label indicates that the garment was manufactured under one roof. This however is an erroneous assumption. Most manufacturers utilize a contingent of freelance designers, contractors for patternmaking and cutting, construction, shipping and distribution. Each component of this process requires education, training and technology -- certainly beyond the secondary educational level.

Therefore when you see a finished garment in a store it is not the talent from just one company that created that garment but possibly as many as 5-6 different companies.

Over the past decade, America's shopping habits have made dramatic changes. Department stores which were once regarded as our most innovative and entrepreneurial retailers, continue to fade, despite the more aggressive merchandising by some of the sharper ones. Whereas not long ago these merchants controlled the lion's share of total apparel sales, today they account for only 16% of the apparel units sold. Many of the giants as we've known them have gone out of business or are in Chapter 11 bankruptcy or on the verge of seeking protection from

creditors. Many of these stores involved are known to all of us such as Bloomingdales, Moss Brothers, Lazaras, Bon Marche, Jordan Marsh, Broadway Department Stores and others.

There are plenty of successes -- retailers and manufacturers are finding ways to outperform the market very handsomely. Innovative design, intelligent positioning and provocative marketing is working. Without them there will be stagnation. Growth can only come by increasing market share, and that requires skilled marketing techniques.

Retail firms which are maximizing on sales help, product knowledge and service are making gains in the competitive market place. Dillards, May Company, Nordstroms and others seem to be successfully following these concepts.

Our number one goal should be to change the trend of utilizing foreign markets and realize more domestic production and thus help with the balance of trade. For the last decade apparel imports have increased 10% per year. In the same decade, consumer demand for apparel increased about 2% a year. It is quite obvious when imports grow 10 percent a year and the U.S. market at 2% a year, that imports are not only satisfying all new demand in our market, they are reducing the share of the market that the domestic industry holds. According to Apparel Industry Magazine (February 1991) imports average 60% overall now, going as high as 70-80% in some items in the apparel field. Firms like Liz Claiborne and The Limited have excelled in worldwide sourcing, ie., finding the most cost-effective and competitive place to manufacture.

But even those who import face potential problems because of uncertainty in the future of Hong Kong, wage escalations in Korea and Taiwan and with unrestricted production opening up in the Carribean, Mexico, South America and possibly other nations. Now more than ever the demand is greatest for individuals educated in importing as well as exporting.

Foreign sourcing is a reality and has forced domestic apparel manufacturers to look for new ways to compete. It is to our advantage to have production closer to our headquarters for several reasons: better control of production, better quality control and reduced shipping costs with less reliance on foreign oil are a few.

We should even be looking further ahead as business executives who can position their companies to take advantage of the rapidly opening markets throughout the world. There is greater potential for market growth in the world today than at any time in the past four decades.

After more than forty years of Communism, many of the non-market economies of Eastern Europe appear to be ready to embrace some type of market system to allocate resources. The combined populations of Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union are as large as the 350 million people living in Western Europe. In all of Europe today, there is a potential for increased apparel demand.

Our direction has to be towards "world class manufacturing". As buzzwords go, no trio has held more meaning for American manufacturing since Henry Ford introduced the assembly line and the Japanese robotized it.

Within the apparel industry, world class manufacturing is even harder to define because apparel firms have only just begun to put its processes and ideology in place. What is certain is that all aspects of apparel manufacturing are affected: quality, training, staff support, sourcing, supplier and customer relations, product design, plant organization, scheduling, inventory management, product line, accounting, labor relations and the roles of automation and the computer.

Richard J. Schonberger author of World Class Manufacturing, the Lessons of Simplicity and author of Japanese Manufacturing Techniques states that world class manufacturing mandates simplicity and direct action. The apparel industry is in its infancy in terms of world class aspirations.

As an employer concerned about the shortage of a qualified labor force, I would hope that the Federal Government would try to enhance its role in the financing of postsecondary education. More and more training will be necessary as our population changes and gets older -- our population as a whole is projected to increase 17.5% by the year 2000. Many of these individuals, including minorities and single-working parents, will require postsecondary training and retraining to prepare for the job market. And schools will have to provide industry with a qualified labor force that we must have available to us is order to grow economically.

Education is the key to competitiveness and a strong productive workforce. All colleges including private and public, two and four year, community and proprietary have a role in assuring the economic health and future of this country.

Testimony before the
Subcommittee on Education, Arts, and Humanities
Committee on Labor and Human Resources
United States Senate

by

John H. Zimmerman
Senior Vice President, Human Resources
MCI Communications Corporation

and a member of the
Secretary's Commission on Achieving Necessary Skills

10:00 a.m.
February 21, 1991
Dirksen Senate Office Building, Room 430

Mr. Chairman and members of the Subcommittee. I appreciate the opportunity to speak to you today. I am especially pleased that you are dedicating this opening hearing on the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act to workforce issues and that you have invited members of the business community to share their thoughts with you. Clearly, your work promises to have long-term ramifications for the continuing economic health of the nation and for American business' ability to compete and thrive in the 1990s and beyond.

Our workforce is one of our nation's greatest assets. It gives us a significant competitive advantage. But, in recent years, we have lost sight of the importance of a quality workforce. As a result, our advantage has slipped. The result is we lose more and more jobs as they go overseas. In some cases, complete industries are gone. We must stop this decline of our workforce capability.

At MCI, we recognize the importance of a highly-skilled workforce. Last year we spent more than $8 million on training, providing more than 750,000 hours of training.

However, we realize this will not keep us competitive. In the 1990s, we expect to double our workforce and to significantly raise the level of skills that we require of prospective employees.

At the same time, we are faced with the decline in the number of those entering the workforce. This number dropped nearly ten percent during the 1980s. It was accompanied by a corresponding

drop in the level of skills. More and more young people are being barred from entering MCI's workforce because they lack the skills we need.

This MCI story is not unique; it is a reflection of our national story. The nation's competitive advantage depends on its people and their ability to maximize their contribution to our enterprises and to our nation.

Our education system must provide the skills necessary -- whether it is for entry-level jobs for students coming out of high schools or for those entering the workforce from postsecondary institutions.

We cannot afford to let our educational system slip and I'm afraid we are doing that today. Our public education system is near collapse. We aren't even going to have enough teachers. This can be addressed by measures like S. 329, the legislation you, Mr. Chairman, and other members of the Subcommittee have introduced. More and more students fail to graduate from high school. And, those who do, are less and less prepared to go on to higher education or to enter the workforce.

Further, we must not erect walls to keep out those who can, and want to, contribute. This means we cannot tolerate inferior public school systems where children become hopelessly lost and never have a chance to be a contributing member of our society. It means we must not let economic disadvantage deny our children the opportunity to pursue the highest level of postsecondary education they can achieve. We need every highly-qualified person

we can get if we are to build a workforce that will provide us a competitive advantage.

We also need to fill up our postsecondary schools with our own citizens, who will enter our workforce, not citizens of other nations who will return to their homelands and contribute to workforces that may end up taking jobs from the United States.

To build the workforce that will give us a competitive advantage, we must understand the skills that are required. Once identified, we must develop these skills. We must measure them and correct the deficiencies we find. This is the work of SCANS, the Secretary's Commission on Achieving Necessary Skills.

Because of my long-standing interest in the link between education and work, I agreed to serve on SCANS. Earlier you heard from the SCANS Executive Director, Dr. Arnold H. Packer. He told you a bit about the approach SCANS is taking and what we are trying to do. I would like to share my perspective with you as a business representative on SCANS.

As Dr. Packer told you, we are beginning by identifying the fundamental skills everyone should possess to be a productive worker. In part, this emphasis is based on the premise that students must know what is expected of them. We must clearly state what kinds of skills and competencies are needed in the workplace.

Another underlying theme in SCANS's approach, is that we must improve -- or, in most cases, create -- an on-going dialogue between schools and the businesses community. Businesses must

tell schools what they need, they must demand a better product from the schools, and schools must be prepared to respond to changing needs.

At the same time, companies cannot continue to do business as usual. A basic principle at MCI is that we recognize and reward the contributions of our employees. SCANS also believes that as businesses demand higher skills, they have to be prepared to reward them.

We can't expect people to commit to education if they do not see it leading them to more meaningful jobs. We must provide career opportunities, which will support personal development and improve retention.

Your work on the Higher Education Act will play a major role in helping us meet the challenge of the years ahead. We can't ignore the need to improve the elementary and secondary school system and we must improve postsecondary opportunities as well.

MCI and other major corporations will need a wide variety of skilled employees. They cut across the spectrum, from the marketing people and the accountants to the engineers who build and maintain the high-tech communications systems we provide throughout the world.

In addition, we must make certain there is education available in non-baccalaureate programs. Seventy-five percent of the jobs in the year 2000 will require some education and training beyond high school. It is important to underscore, however, that many of the jobs won't require a traditional college degree. MCI,

for example, relies on many people, such as technicians, who receive high-quality postsecondary training through non-baccalaureate programs.

I firmly believe that the actions you take will have a vital impact on the economic future of the nation. While American businesses must continue to increase their commitment to investing in their own employees, they will also continue to rely on the products of the postsecondary system of education. Your work, to a large degree, will not only determine whether individuals will have the opportunity to get the education and training they need, but it will also be a major factor in determining the future success of American business.

We must make our workforce our country's greatest competitive advantage -- not a disadvantage. We must open the doors to our children who seek to contribute to society and we must prepare them to maximize their contribution. They must never be denied by inadequate schools or by their economic status.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to participate in this hearing and I would be happy to answer any questions.

# # #

Thomas Ehrlich
President, Indiana University

Testimony presented to
Subcommittee on Education, Arts and Humanities
United States Senate
February 21, 1991

EDUCATING THE NEW MAJORITY

Chairman Pell, members of the Committee, my thanks for the opportunity to be with you. I am most grateful, and I will appreciate inclusion of my full testimony in the record.

A myriad of issues face colleges and universities today, reflecting the increasing complexity of the world my colleagues teach and write about, as well as inhabit. On prior occasions like this I have focused on policy issues relating to research universities. Today I shift gears to underscore some policy implications of a simple fact about higher education: a majority of all undergraduates in this country are older, part-time, students--wage-earners with families. Indiana University mirrors America--those adult learners are (by a small margin) a majority of our 92,000 students.

New majority students, as I like to call them, are changing the face of higher education across the country. The task for our colleges and universities is to recast the mold of undergraduate eduction so we can better serve these students. Federal policies should be recast as well.

The mold of undergraduate education was formed by outstanding liberal-arts colleges, teaching students in residential settings. Those students were all in transition from adolescense to adulthood. They were also primarily white and middle class.

This mold still shapes higher education--though not its student population. It also shapes much of federal policy for higher education. This reality is particularly troubling in the arena of federal financial aid. U.S. policies regarding eligibility, disbursement, and repayment often present prohibitive obstacles for independent, part-time students--and most new majority students are necessarily part time, with job and family commitments.

Many universities, including Indiana, already have decades of experience in teaching non-traditional students. Yet still we often glibly talk about "accommodating" these students, rather than designing educational programs for them. We too rarely invest in services to ease their transition to college, or take enough time to understand the full range of their needs, personal as well as educational.

In the spring of 1990, the chancellors of each of Indiana University's campuses, along with several of our academic colleagues, met with me at New Harmony, Indiana, to discuss IU's efforts to educate the new majority. Our attention to the new majority emerges from the University-wide planning process that we began over three years ago. The first fruits of these efforts, based largely on the work of faculty task forces in 1987, were published as a working paper, IU: One University--Indiana at its Best.

In a subsequent paper, Our University in the State: Lessons Learned, I reported on the progress we were making in implementing our academic agenda. I drew from my

experiences during the last two years of academic planning to state my ambition for Indiana University:

> to be an international research university of the first rank while simultaneously being a national leader in reaching out to higher education's emerging new majority.

Sustaining Indiana University's standing as a research university of the first rank calls for investments in our research capability--including the ability to attract and retain faculty and staff, to provide adequate support for graduate students, to acquire materials for our libraries, and to construct new facilities vital to the continued strength of our research programs in the natural and biomedical sciences. In this realm, the key challenge is to define our research missions in ways that are sufficiently focused and persuasive to attract the necessary investments from State, Federal, and private sources.

Providing national leadership in the teaching of higher education's new majority involves a different challenge; it too, requires sustained investment, imagination, and ingenuity. In a fundamental sense, that challenge entails recasting the mold of undergraduate education--a mold that was formed by liberal-arts colleges, teaching traditional-age, primarily white students in residential settings. Indiana University, like other major universities across the country, has already moved a fair distance from the traditional mold in the substance of what we teach, particularly in our professional schools. Even in substantive terms, however, and certainly in terms of how we teach substance, much of what we do is organized on principles fashioned for the instruction of adolescent students whose primary allegiance--of time and attention--is to their college

or university. First and foremost, they are students. Most such students, in the past and today, face some initial shock in "breaking away" from their families and high school friends. But serious competitors rarely exist for their minds and emotions when they have settled as undergraduates. For most of them, therefore, the anxiety is temporary; they soon adjust, bond to their "home away from home," and identify with their peers. It is for these students that the delivery of contemporary undergraduate education has been tailored.

New majority students approach their entry or reentry into undergraduate education within much different and more variegated contexts. For the new majority student, college is a commitment evidenced by a personal decision to attend. Many are the first members of their family to go to college, and they often arrive on our campuses anxious about the step they have taken, wondering whether or not they really have what it takes to be successful. Our challenge--the challenge of recasting the mold--is to help them aspire to the best their talents can achieve, and then provide the education that will enable them to continue learning throughout their lives.

In Lessons Learned I sought to sharpen our focus by defining IU's comparative advantage as a national educational laboratory:

> I know of no university better equipped to take on the challenge of reaching out to the new majority. . . . We are large and diverse enough to confront the full spectrum of issues, small and compact enough to be able to share experiences and resources across campus boundaries.

The purpose of our gathering at New Harmony was to further the process of design and definition--to provide a clearer sense of where we want the University to go, how we expect to get there, and by what criteria we will judge the success of the journey.

We began by recognizing a special strength: IU has for many decades been engaged in educating and serving nontraditional students. Most of our faculty and staff have made that undertaking a center of their professional lives. IU has a reputation for serving an entire State in ways that are not matched elsewhere. An early example was the School of Continuing Studies, which still plays an important role in serving these students. Yet even across our University we still talk too glibly about "accommodating" nontraditional students, rather than of designing educational programs to address their needs. Too often we speak of maintaining standards and preserving purposes, as if by serving the new majority we risk compromising the value of a college education.

Hence the difficulty of our assignment. Educational programs designed specifically for nontraditional learners have never been a main course on higher education's menu. Over the past year, I have asked colleagues at other universities how their institutions serve such learners. Their answers have not been reassuring. Too frequently, new majority students seem to be offered warmed-over educational fare, initially prepared for traditional students. There is often an assumption that a new majority student whose educational history includes part-time and intermittent enrollment is a student who bears an educational deficit. Too many discussions of the new majority center on the need for "remedial" education, as though the necessity of adopting different teaching methods or

styles should denote a deficiency on the part of the nontraditional learner. Too often one hears the sentiment that if the nation's educational system worked properly, there would be less need for special programs to teach students who "fail" to earn a baccalaureate degree in the traditional way.

With the new majority as our agenda, the retreat at New Harmony produced what to me was a truly extraordinary dialogue--and, not surprisingly, yet another set of lessons that should guide our future planning. There was a general affirmation of the saliency and appropriateness of a focus on new majority students by each of the Chancellors on behalf of their individual campuses. Most important, they are prepared to accept the challenge.

Who Are the New Majority?

The first lesson we learned at our New Harmony retreat was how little we really know about new majority students. We need to understand much better who these students are and why they seek postsecondary education. A small anecdote may illustrate the point. During the initial session at New Harmony, I reported that 94% of new majority students were seeking a degree. We knew this, I assured my colleagues, because our students had told us so on an IU form. The Chancellors looked bewildered, then laughed. The form, they said, is used to determine preference in class registration. Only "degree-seeking students" are given preference. As a result, almost all students identify themselves as pursuing a degree, whatever their intentions. It may be, the

Chancellors gently told me, that 94% of new majority students do intend to gain a baccalaureate degree, but responses to our form are insufficient evidence to prove the point.

One of the sad truths is that it is currently easiest to describe new majority students in terms of what they are not--among commuting students most are not young, or not full time, and among residential students most are not white. What they are is extraordinarily diverse--indeed, our new majority planning effort is itself a celebration of diversity, a refusal to catalog superficially.

Once the diversity of the new majority was recognized at New Harmony, it became possible to discuss what those students have in common. Two groups of new majority students tend to predominate at Indiana University. One group includes primarily commuting students with several (though often not all) of these four characteristics: they are older than 25; they are wage earners; they have families; and they attend IU part time. A second and distinct group includes traditional-age African American and Hispanic students living on or near the Bloomington campus (although the first group includes a significant percentage of minority students on some other campuses). A key similarity is that for most students in both groups college is not a "rite of passage." The process of adjustment to the University and bonding to it are often more difficult for both groups than for traditional-age white students on a residential campus. A feeling of belonging is often harder to develop. Problems such as retention are, therefore, accentuated for both groups.

For the nontraditional commuting learner, "being at school" tends not to be the single organizing fact of life. Family and job and commitments are likely to overshadow schooling as the center stage of attention and effort. The sense of time, of purpose, of capacity to invest energy and money is generally calculated in terms of non-University responsibilities and obligations that contend for the same resources as IU. The University certainly does matter--for many new majority students, it may matter more than for traditional students in the sense that it involves greater costs and sacrifice--but it usually does not matter most.

An economic imperative underlies the commitment that most commuting new majority students make to higher education. They generally think learning can be translated rather directly into economic opportunities in the workplace. This reality underlies my belief that we need what a former university president, Martin Meyerson, called "a new synthesis of liberal and professional learning." Most new majority students want to begin or enhance a professional career, and Meyerson rightly urged that liberal learning should link more closely with professional education than is true at most universities. We have special opportunities to provide that linkage at IU.

Though our evidence is only anecdotal, we do believe that most new majority students are seeking a degree. Some are employees who want advanced professional and technical training, often financed by their employers. Some are young adults who choose to live at home and who seek to learn while they work. And lest we forget, many are

returning with rusty skills--at significant cost to themselves--to pursue opportunities they once considered closed.

Women constitute a larger share of this group than men, and women are more likely to be in need of significant support services. Most female adult learners return to our University as part of a transition, the impetus of which is often the need to become a principal wage earner in the family. Some women return because their husbands have lost jobs, because the expenses of their families exceed their incomes, or because they have become the heads of single-parent households. In talking with some of these women, and with those on our campuses who work with them, I am struck by the courage and commitment of their decisions to enroll and, at the same time, the enormous financial hardships and psychological challenges they incur.

Male adult learners seem similarly in a state of transition, but more often it is a change occasioned by work--the need to be employed, to qualify for promotion, or to be chosen for new employment after being laid off. For some, the shock of economic change is profoundly disturbing; for others, it is truly liberating. Chancellor Joanne Lantz of Fort Wayne told us of a group of laid-off blue collar workers, mostly men, who were entitled to educational benefits as part of their employment separation. For many of these workers-turned-students, an IU education provided an opportunity to rearrange their lives, to take on new roles--and try out new identities--they never thought themselves able to pursue.

Discussions on all eight of our campuses persuade me that our new majority students, women and men, are generally both more motivated to succeed academically at IU and more anxious about success than their traditional counterparts. The transitions--personal and professional--that are frequently the catalysts for return to classroom learning highten their anxieties, and their fears of failure too often add impetus to leaving IU without the degrees they initially sought.

There is a paradox reflected in these observations. At New Harmony, as elsewhere, we began our conversations by noting how different nontraditional learners are from traditional college students--indeed, there are substantial, at times monumental differences. Yet the two groups have much in common as they embark on their college careers. Both are in transition. Both are often worried, if not scared, by their prospects. American colleges and universities have, over the generations, developed programs for easing the transition for traditional college freshmen, helping to encourage their sense of well-being, self-discovery, and commitment to intellectual inquiry. For new majority students, however, we too rarely make investments in those programs, at least in part because we too seldom take the time to understand the full range of their needs--again, personal as well as educational.

New Language and New Structures

At New Harmony our Chancellors underscored that we need a better articulation of our mission to serve new majority students. We need more purposeful

experimentation, more communication of results, more sharing of ideas. We need to talk more with each other, with new majority students, and with faculty members about both the importance and the excitement of teaching those students.

A personal experience may help illuminate the point. In my first two years at IU, I taught both traditional and new majority undergraduates--the former in Bloomington, and the latter in Indianapolis. Last year I taught a class in ethics and professions via interactive television linking traditional students in Bloomington and primarily new majority students in Indianapolis. I moved back and forth, while the students remained on each campus. For the first time, I understood directly what many faculty colleagues have told me--how many insights can be gained by each group of students from the other. I watched while what could be described as "two-way mentoring" intensified. At the same time, I was frequently reminded that I had designed the course for traditional students. It was only part way through the semester that I began to think about how to recast the materials and class discussions to take advantage of the students' strengths in teaching each other. At a minimum, I could have drawn more consciously on the experiences of the Indianapolis students both as parents and as members of the work force.

At the New Harmony retreat, our discussions were informed by two perspectives for seeking a new understanding of how to serve better the educational needs of new majority learners. The first perspective I have already sketched: for the new majority, just as for the traditional student, the collegiate experience is a period of important

transition. Each time a nontraditional student enrolls in a college course, it is an affirmation of a decision to explore. The programs IU offers must recognize and reinforce these students' decisions to seek an educational transition. Currently, the proportion of new majority students who continue their undergraduate education until graduation is far less than we believe can be achieved. We need to focus particularly on means that will encourage and support sustained academic success by these students. The task is challenging for both experienced adult students who commute and minority students in residence.

As I wrote in Lessons Learned, "What we require are modern institutions that incorporate the key elements of a liberal arts college: a coherent educational experience, an integrated introduction to the arts and sciences, and a sense of social and institutional belonging." We need to be sure that Indiana University is one of those modern institutions; it must achieve "that all-important sense of adhering in settings that serve higher education's emerging new majority." We cannot precisely replicate the special bonding to college and to fellow students that traditional undergraduates feel--nor should we try. We can and should, however, enhance significantly the cohesion that links new majority students to each other and to IU.

The second perspective was supplied by Chancellor Dan Cohen of South Bend who suggested that we depart from the traditional freshman-to-senior paradigm and define the undergraduate experience of returning adult students in three distinct phases, each of which may last several years. The initial phase is a time of introduction and, for many,

of refresher or remediation courses. It is also a time of exploration, when peers are of particular importance in reinforcing the efficacy of continued education. The middle phase is a period of increasing focus on the major, as well as increasing intellectual maturity as one becomes more familiar with the modes and tools of a particular course of study. The final phase is a time of integration and conclusion.

One does not need to be certain that this troika is the right conceptual model to recognize that the traditional quartet--freshman, sophomore, junior, senior--is not. The very language of traditional baccalaureate seasons and identities carries a message of failure for those whose education proceeds in nontraditional patterns. The three-phase approach has the advantage of helping break out of the old mold by requiring a more explicit as well as substantive analysis of the needs of new majority students.

Recasting the Mold to Educate the New Majority

The richness of our discussions at New Harmony persuades us that our University can play a key national role in strengthening and redesigning a range of programs--some serving commuting adult students of all backgrounds, some serving residential African American and Hispanic students. To do so means intensifying our efforts to make new majority students the focus of University-wide planning, an important part of our agenda to enhance the University's academic distinction.

Because new majority students are themselves extraordinarily diverse, our planning must take explicit advantage of the wide range of settings each campus brings to the task. At the same time, we should recognize that our principal advantage is the wealth of experience our faculty members have in teaching new majority students. The process must necessarily begin by collecting and cataloging our most effective programs, analyzing them to see what accounts for their successes, and learning to communicate better among faculty facing similar challenges.

Finally, our planning should focus particularly on relatively simple innovations. One of the most fascinating aspects of our discussions at New Harmony was the sense that some fairly rudimentary steps can trigger a process of serving the new majority's educational needs more effectively. Most of what we discussed fell into two broad categories: steps to increase the "connectedness" of new majority students both to the University and to each other and steps to take better account of how new majority students invest time and energy in their studies. They were <u>not</u> steps that require significantly increased University expenditures.

Some of the ideas considered at New Harmony reflect what faculty are already doing on at least one of our campuses; others are new initiatives. These eight are examples:

- A one-credit introductory course entitled "IU Success." Some sections are taught one hour a week for eight weeks; some are offered in a single weekend. The aim is to introduce--or reintroduce--students taking their first

courses at IU to ways to minimize their fears and make the best use of the University's resources.

- The use of study groups as a formal course component, with selected assignments made to those groups rather than to individual students. The groups encourage students to teach one another and increase their sense of belonging to the University and of identity with their fellow students. To the extent that students with similar interests or backgrounds can be assigned to the same study groups, ideally in several courses, they can reinforce each other's strengths.
- Greater reliance on modes of self-paced learning and instruction, combined with loosely structured discussion seminars. The seminars can provide needed cohesion in a small-group setting. What would otherwise be a larger class meeting three times a week, for example, might--with computer-aided instruction--meet only once a week, with students having three possible times from which to choose, depending on their schedules.
- The use of electronic bulletin boards to link study groups or other class subsections in ways that require, or at least encourage, all members to communicate with each other on a regular basis, though all on their own schedules.

- Conscious encouragement of new majority students to seek their degrees "with honors," using a range of reinforcement techniques and incentives to promote self-identification and interaction of the honors students.
- Enhancement of campus clubs and other organizations. Activities that provide public-service opportunities offer a particularly rich array of possibilities.
- The expanded use of standard competency examinations in basic subjects, for which students receive credit when the examinations are successfully completed.
- The provision or expansion of peer counseling for new majority students to help them adjust or readjust to classroom routines and test taking.

When we turned to examining how new majority students invest time and energy in their studies, it became clear that we need to rethink both the ways we schedule course offerings for those students and the ways we award academic credit. Like other colleges and universities, IU has made substantial accommodations for working learners--scheduling many of our courses after 5 p.m., offering weekend colleges and seminars, and conducting courses at off-campus sites across the State. We need to think purposefully about doing more--about possibly changing the basic divisions of credit hours and semesters in which the curriculum is expressed. Our discussions at New Harmony demonstrated that although there are no ready answers as to the best forms

that experimentation might take, it is time to try out different educational structures for new majority students.

Next Steps

The diversity that new majority students bring to our educational endeavors makes it important that the focus of our planning be on our individual campuses. Each campus has already developed significant experience and can build on that experience. What works in one setting may not work in another. Most important, making the campus the focus of the planning will allow a greater range of experimentation and provide greater opportunity for faculty initiative than would be possible if the planning were centralized.

In agreeing to make new majority students a planning priority, each Chancellor also agreed to lead his or her campus in taking on specific aspects of the challenge. The Chancellors have been working since then with key faculty and staff members on their campus plans for this effort. Out of their efforts each Chancellor has developed his or her own campus "charge."

Bloomington

The Bloomington campus has always had many nontraditional adult learners, and we are working to provide more opportunities for these students. Bloomington's new majority focus, however, is on traditional-age minority undergraduates, particularly African American and Hispanic students. This group shares similar needs with other new majority students. The campus must recruit more minorities, ease their transition to life on a predominantly white residential campus, examine means to bond them more strongly to campuswide activities, and develop programs to guarantee their retention and

successful degree completion. Throughout the Big Ten, minorities tend to receive degrees over a five-year period at a rate 20% below that of their white counterparts. Improving this rate, along with increasing the numbers of minority students, poses a major challenge for the campus.

Minority students who come to Bloomington make a commitment to their educations similar to that of traditional undergraduates. The campus has already developed several programs for enhancing minority student success. It is clear, however, that more needs to be done. The Bloomington Faculty Council has approved a range of new initiatives that, are helping to improve the climate for minorities on campus. Beyond that, we are examining the experiences of the Groups Program and the Minority Achievers Program, as well as the experiences of other residential campuses in the Big Ten to discover the most successful elements of minority retention programs. Chief among these seems to be the use of mentors--not only faculty and staff mentors for each undergraduate minority student, but also peer mentors at the upperclass levels. Such mentor programs are being developed by the University Division and by each of the academic schools. Also, we are exploring with the Neal-Marshall Club of the Alumni Association and with Latino alumni the possibility of linking each of our minority undergraduates with a minority alumnus or alumna who is willing to provide the kind of role model that might increase the possibilities of success. Moreover, the campus is

continuing its minority faculty recruitment program and establishing goals for departments and schools over the next five years.

The entire campus is working toward the completion of the new Neal-Marshall Black Culture Center and toward enhancements of La Casa and other student groups that focus on programs and activities for minority undergraduates. These structures and programs are not means to separate minorities, but rather to underline our commitment to them in a manner analogous to the International House, which emphasizes our commitment to international students and celebrates the diversity they bring to the Bloomington campus.

Kenneth R. R. Gros Louis
Chancellor

East

As the smallest of the Indiana University campuses, the East campus is readily able to experiment with alternative approaches to educating new majority students. In order to improve our ability to serve East's students, 80% of whom work full or part time and have family responsibilities, a reconceptualization of the academic calendar is necessary. To this end, the campus is scheduling some courses within a 12-month calendar progression with the intent of shortening the time necessary for full- and part-time students to complete a degree. Under the present calendar, a part-time student may take as long as six years to complete an associate degree; such students are being encouraged to avail themselves of a broader selection of courses during the summer

months. Another goal of this revision is to maximize the use of campus resources without a reduction in the quality of instruction or services.

In addition to experimenting with 12-month course progressions, IU East is examining course patterns in order to identify alternative structures to meet particular student needs. Specifically, several introductory-level 3-credit hour courses with high attrition rates are being studied to see if they can be offered in three linked one-credit-hour modules. This approach will allow us to serve new majority students better by delivering instruction in ways more manageable for students with substantial work and family commitments.

Charlie Nelms
Chancellor

Fort Wayne

IPFW strives to focus its services on new majority students through a newly created Center for Women and Returning Adults, focused orientation programs, skill development sessions, student activities built around the major, and placement programs for graduating students.

IPFW faculty members pay special attention to the learning styles and requirements of new majority students. Through the Faculty Senate, the campus has underscored its commitment. The faculty and its leaders are examining new ways of learning and teaching--involving not only classes on weekends, but in other time blocks and configurations such as eight-week concentrated workshops rather than semester-length

courses. The agricultural calendar model does not necessarily serve the needs of part-time students in the last decade of the twentieth century. The Office of Academic Affairs is conducting campuswide discussions on teaching and teaching effectiveness this year, and part of that effort focuses on the teaching and learning styles of new majority students.

Finally, the work of three task forces on interdisciplinary general education continues to address our new majority students. Formed late last year, each task force is to create, over a three-year period, a two-semester interdisciplinary course in (respectively) the humanities, the social sciences, and the natural sciences. Each task force comprises faculty from our professional schools as well as arts and sciences, and each task force is working to blend the liberal arts with professional education. Some faculty believe that the new two-semester courses, if successful, have the potential to become the core general education learning experiences for IPFW's professionally oriented students.

Joanne Lantz
Chancellor

Indianapolis

Experimentation on the campus includes new ways of establishing learning communities among students to reinforce the ambitions that lead them to enroll at IUPUI. We are using technology, especially computing and video technology, to support

that learning process. Incorporated in this effort is planning for the new campus library, which will serve as a technologically sophisticated learning center designed to accommodate students who cannot always use library resources in traditional ways. Technology is also being used to increase the availability of learning opportunities through additional sites and neighborhood centers. In a pilot project currently underway, we have used an electronic bulletin board to link students with each other and with faculty members.

We are designing creative alternatives to the sense of community that comes from an experience on a residential campus. We are searching for ways to create a "bonding" between the student and the institution, with the faculty, and with other students, which we hope will sustain the interest of new majority students. We are taking a fresh look at student services, campus life, advising, and even forms of student government to create the type of environment that supports the learning styles of new majority students. As a part of the process, we are taking advantage of city and urban resources to complement the cultural and intellectual activities of the campus. For example, several arrangements are being made for IUPUI students to attend the Indianapolis Symphony Orchestra and the Indiana Repertory Theatre in cooperation with campus music and theatrical programs.

We are continuing to experiment with scheduling and course development to match our offerings to the needs of students and their learning objectives. We are also at work on a coordinated research project involving several offices on the pedagogy and

methodology of new majority student learning. One early result has led to creating a workshop on teaching new majority students as part of a new faculty orientation program; many new faculty have taught only traditional-age students in residential settings and are unfamiliar with the rewards and challenges that come from classes typical of the IUPUI campus.

Finally, increased emphasis on assessment and data collection at IUPUI will yield a better understanding of the needs and special opportunities presented by new majority students. Of particular note is the work of two visiting scholars: Trudy Banta of the University of Tennessee and Uri Treisman of the University of California. They are working with faculty at IUPUI in planning programs and evaluation measures to encourage new majority students to complete their degrees through a better institutional understanding of academic goals and the means we use to achieve them.

Gerald L. Bepko
Chancellor

Kokomo

Throughout this year a special Kokomo faculty committee is examining ways to enhance our teaching of new majority students. Simultaneously we are expanding our reach as a campus serving the new majority. We are developing the means to deliver courses to sites in north central Indiana via television and initiate a "weekend college"

that will enable students to meet their educational needs by attending college on Fridays and Saturdays.

For the returning adult student, we plan to establish an "Academic Boot Camp" with an external grant. This is a prematriculation summer program designed to provide an intensive experience in English and mathematics for students with academic deficiencies in these disciplines and for apprehensive students who want a refresher course.

We are establishing an Adult Education/Resource Center located in a high-traffic area on the campus. All adult students will be able to receive counseling at the center to help them readjust to the academic environment. The center will assist adult students in overcoming the academic and psychological barriers associated with returning to college. The center does not duplicate traditional services but will be a clearinghouse for referrals to other campus offices. It will house information on services for new majority students such as enhancing study skills, coping with parenthood, and selecting career options.

Finally, the Kokomo campus is in a region dominated by high technology industry, and we are sensitive to the educational needs of employees in that industry. The largest employer in our area is Delco Electronics; many of its employees are currently enrolled on our campus. To meet the needs of Delco Electronics and other high technology industries, we are now planning to strengthen our course offerings in the area of production (operations research) to cover quality control, distribution, plant location, and

production scheduling. Our proposed M.B.A. program, developed at the urging of those in industry, will emphasize the development of management skills to deal with changing technology.

Arthur C. Gentile
Acting Chancellor

Northwest

One of the principal challenges this nation faces is the reinvigoration of its public schools, particularly those that serve urban communities and at-risk youngsters. In this effort, new majority students seeking careers in teaching are a wellspring of talent and energy. IU Northwest, with a long and distinguished history of working with public schools, is developing options specifically for new majority students seeking careers in elementary and high school teaching through our nationally recognized Urban Teacher Education Program.

A second important national challenge involves support for those in urban areas who require social services. As in teaching, some of those most able to bring insight and power to the social services arena are new majority learners. Working with area service agencies, IU Northwest has developed a Master of Social Work for new majority students seeking careers that address the needs of at-risk populations.

These programs and initiatives were key agenda items during a retreat attended by our academic leadership and campus planning committee. Additionally, during the summer of 1990, two faculty groups focused on initiatives to help new majority students

acquire writing skills and to provide them with placement and counseling services. The 1990-91 IU Northwest Academic Issues Symposia have addressed similar issues relating to new majority students' support and curricula.

Peggy G. Elliott
Chancellor

South Bend

South Bend students face not one but many transitions in college, as they negotiate between the multiple demands and successive requirements of university study and competing claims of family, community, and workplace. For the new majority, achieving college success means crossing a series of thresholds.

IUSB faculty have begun to consider the impact of these issues on our diverse student body by defining common "problematic conditions" that affect teaching and learning. They include protracted and interrupted study; lack of support for academic goals; lack of understanding of academic values and conventions; lack of basic communication, reading, math, and study skills; conflict of responsibilities and interests; and low self-confidence and aspirations. During the current year, campus discussion, debate, and planning are focused on those problems and on easing the transitions, while we affirm the unique strengths and virtues of our students.

Perhaps the most difficult and important transition for a new majority student comes at the entry level or during the freshman year. In the context of our discussion of common new majority concerns, IUSB faculty are developing a comprehensive strategy

for threshold experiences: the transition into college, the introduction to the intellectual challenges of general education, the development of college competencies, and the choice of a major. We expect that this strategy will include orientation, assessment, the enrichment of academic opportunities and support resources, and the development of a mentor network (including faculty, staff, and peer) to provide advising and linkage to students throughout their college careers. A related activity is the revision and evaluation of our college "success"/transition course, first created at this campus a decade ago.

Of course, we recognize that the threshold experience is only one of many related new majority challenges. We continue to explore ways to take better advantage of our students' community connections, emphasizing our continued concern about the complex relationship of classroom and workplace. The campus has set a high priority on minority recruitment and retention, including the projected opening of an office of minority affairs and the creation of mentorship programs. Recognizing the needs of many of our students for the development of basic skills as well as college-level proficiency, we are enhancing our Academic Resource Center's assessment, tutoring, and preparatory programs and provide additional student advising and support services for the returning adult student.

Daniel Cohen
Chancellor

Southeast

Members of the IU Southeast faculty and staff have demonstrated that they are capable, flexible, understanding, and determined to make higher education available to all residents of southern Indiana. Most of our students are new majority students. They come with a range of strengths and weaknesses, with varying skills, and with differing degrees of family and financial support. Their desire to learn, however--whether from one course or a four-year degree program--is much the same.

Though IU Southeast has been relatively successful in recruiting new majority students, our record of retention and degree completion is not as impressive. IU Southeast is addressing these issues and will continue to do so in the coming years.

We have established an Adult Student Center to coordinate student services and to serve as a focal point for programs directed at new majority students. The principal challenge of the center is to draw new majority students into the mainstream of campus life.

The Adult Student Center is responsible for providing general information and for directing inquiries for all nondegree and adult students. An extended orientation to college is being provided to new majority students, focusing on such topics as career planning, self-esteem, study skills, time management, and stress management. Further, the Adult Student Center is offering workshop programs; providing continuing opportunities for student interaction; publishing an adult student newsletter; organizing

adult study groups; conducting surveys on the needs of new majority students; and coordinating a group of adult student volunteers/peer counselors.

Leon Rand
Chancellor

University Tasks

To complement the planning activities of the campuses, the University as a whole is undertaking three special tasks.

Support a series of faculty seminars on teaching new majority students. At New Harmony my colleagues commented frequently on how much our faculty know and how little opportunity they have to share experiences of how best to design and teach programs for the new majority. IU is in fact a storehouse of largely uncataloged success stories. We are sponsoring a series of faculty seminars for interested colleagues, coordinated by Professor Eileen Bender. These seminars should provide settings for the kind of sharing that has been in short supply. As a result, we should develop an inventory reflecting the strengths of our current programs, lists of initiatives worth trying in the future, and strategies for evaluating the effectiveness of new majority education at IU.

Develop a clear statistical portrait of new majority students across the University. We are just beginning to learn how to capture statistically the diversity new majority students bring to our University. In the past, we have been hampered by definitions that principally make sense for traditional students. Accounting is also made difficult by

administrative practices that, in making life bureaucratically simpler, make new majority students look like traditional students for purposes of registration and financial aid. We are now beginning to use data collected by each campus to supplement central records and to develop more imaginative ways to analyze our basic student files. Our efforts to understand better who belongs to the new majority and the needs they bring to our campuses have been significantly aided by a number of thoughtful, campus-based studies, most notably one by John H. Newman, professor of sociology at IU Southeast. At the same time, we have undertaken a special survey of new majority students. The added information will help us understand the statistical and demographic data we currently collect on a regular basis. This task is being coordinated by Vice President Judy Palmer.

Evaluate the extent to which current financial aid policies and practices arbitrarily work against nontraditional learners. The more we explore the world of the new majority student, the more I have become aware of the often artificial rules that limit their access to financial aid. Some of those rules are our own; some are imposed by others, using definitions that we supply; and some are wholly beyond our control. We need to understand better the rules and their effects on nontraditional students and the extent to which we can--or should--change policy and practice. Vice President Palmer and Sara McNabb, assistant vice president for enrollment services, are leading this effort.

A Closing Observation

I am still occasionally asked by people inside and outside the University, "Is IU really serious about the new majority?" Some who ask the question are skeptical that IU can both sustain its role as a major research university and establish itself as a national leader in teaching higher education's new majority. To these concerned friends I have responded by emphasizing that our compact with the State is to be a University that serves fully the needs of Indiana--by attracting distinguished scholars and major research enterprises, and by providing its citizens educational opportunities that will enhance the quality of their lives as well as their personal productivity. I try to make clear that the intertwining of these two missions is the basis for our claim to State support as an investment in the future.

More troubling have been those who--by asking, "Are you serious?"--imply that we have neither the will nor the programs to stay the course--that the new majority is just a clever rhetorical device to dress up a mission that is peripheral to the University's real concerns. Many of those asking the question have themselves spent much of their professional lives teaching nontraditional learners. Some see their roles as being essentially second class in the University's priorities. In responding to these skeptics, I have tried to convey my own conviction that serving the new majority is not only necessary--in the future these students will increasingly dominate--but a challenge worthy of the best intellects among us. I ask them to join in a process of educational redesign that holds the promise of changing the face of higher education across America.

My personal prediction is that our efforts to recast the mold of undergraduate education--impelled by the need to serve new majority students--will redound to the benefit of traditional students as well. My expectation, based more on instinct than experience, is that as we reshape the delivery of courses for nontraditional learners, we will be forced to reconsider their effectiveness for all students.

In earlier discussions of this vision, I lacked a concrete example drawn from the past as evidence that the molds of undergraduate education can be recast. Chancellor Lee Rand supplied that example at New Harmony. He reminded us of the GI Bill and of how the adult learners it brought to American institutions of higher education after World War II energized campuses across this nation. They were a new breed, more questioning, more insistent that their education matter, more willing to extend themselves to get the best of what their institutions had to offer. At the same time, they were closely bonded to each other and to their universities--goals we seek for all members of the new majority, whether they are commuting adults or traditional-age residential African American and Hispanic students.

Our new majority planning seeks a parallel transformation of the education of nontraditional learners across our State. Ultimately, IU's leadership could become a model for a similar transformation throughout American higher education. I am convinced that the opportunity is within our grasp, provided that we draw on the collective strengths of past experiences to forge arrangements designed for the new majority. We require planning that both celebrates the diversity of our students and

campuses and draws them together more effectively in a shared enterprise. We need to say to the State of Indiana that serving new majority students means providing them with comprehensive opportunities--sets of programs that fit well together. We need to send the clear message that our mission is the postsecondary education of all of Indiana's citizens--and mean it.

Lastly, we need an educational vision that combines the timeless values of the liberal arts with the drive of our new majority students for personal achievement and professional attainment. I was reminded of the intertwinings of these endeavors by many of our colleagues who commented on an earlier draft of this report. In particular, two letters from IU faculty with long-standing commitments to teaching new majority students summed up the challenge we have set for ourselves. The first of these letters was from Jan Shipps, professor of religious studies at IUPUI. By her own account, Professor Shipps was a new majority student "back in the days when the category hardly existed. . . . The exhilaration of returning to the classroom after a dozen years was so great that I was able to overlook the fact I appeared to be the only student out of his or her twenties in any of my classes." She went on to observe:

> Perhaps those memories make it possible for me to be more flexible in dealing with new majority students than are many of my colleagues. In order to permit working students to meet the obligations of the workplace and parents to care for their children . . . I regularly permit the rescheduling of examinations and allow for late papers without penalty. I am as concerned as the next member of the faculty about maintaining standards and preserving the educational purposes of the University. But I concluded long ago

> that the pattern of strict discipline exemplified by the "no late papers" rule . . . is simply not needed by most of the adults who make the effort (and the investment) to return to school.

The second letter was from Paul Barton-Kriese, professor of political science at IU East. He, too, saw the diversity as well as the drive and ambition new majority students bring to their studies. For him, the challenge before us is to develop programs that work. He states:

> I see especially on our campus that the traditional freshman-senior paradigm is not always appropriate. Students do "stop out" for a time. They do take longer than four years to do degrees. . . . And when these people do not finish degrees their self-esteem, and their interest, plummet. And then both the student and the institution fail.
>
> Again here at East we are experimenting with using our weeks and our days in different configurations to expedite this time spent so students can finish sooner than they have traditionally done. A degree which has taken about six years to do, or longer, can be done sooner, even closer to the four years if that is useful or desired. But it is not always desirable to finish in four years for these people. We need to be aware not to create structures that these students do not need or do not want.

* * * *

I have been reminded of the importance of our challenge while rereading Robert M. Hutchins, who made unique contributions to the character of undergraduate education for traditional students. The power of his belief in the liberal arts as the foundation of a well-educated citizenry in our democracy fashioned the undergraduate curriculum not only at the University of Chicago, where he was president, but at colleges and universities throughout the country.

It is less well remembered that President Hutchins was equally interested in the education of experienced adults. As he put the matter:

> The education of adults has uniformly been designated either to make up for the deficiencies of their schooling, in which case it might terminate when these gaps had been filled, or it has consisted of vocational training, in which case it might terminate when training adequate to the post in question has been gained.

To the contrary, he urged what he labeled "interminable education":

> We who say, then, that we believe in democracy cannot content ourselves with virtual education anymore than we can with virtual representation. . . . We cannot concede that the conquest of nature, the conquest of drudgery, and the conquest of political power must lead in combination to triviality in education, and hence in all other occupations of life. The aim of education is wisdom, and each must have the chance to become as wise as he can.

Our challenge at Indiana University is to give that chance to all our new majority students.

THE COLLEGE FOR HUMAN SERVICES
345 Hudson Street, New York, N.Y. 10014 (212) 989-2002
Audrey C. Cohen, *President and Founder*

February 21st, 1991

Testimony Before the U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Education for Reauthorization of the Higher Education Act

by Audrey C. Cohen
President, The College for Human Services

Ladies and gentlemen. You are participating today in making decisions that will shape much of the future of American higher education. And so I would like to take this opportunity to ask us to look at the **large picture** of higher education. In what direction is it headed? And how can we influence that direction for the better?

Two overriding trends dominate higher education today. Unfortunately, these trends are having increasingly negative effects.

The first trend is the trend toward **increasing technologization of education**. More and more, educators limit their teaching to passing on specialized information, information which will help students perform specialized tasks in a technologically oriented world. As the focus of each course and of each discipline becomes narrower and narrower, education is slowly but surely abandoning its age-long commitment to developing the whole person. We are forgetting our democratic commitment to creating

Copyright c 1991 Audrey C. Cohen, The College for Human Services

citizens who possess a **broad view** of how what they know fits into and can be of use to the larger society.

At the same time that learning is increasingly technologized and specialized, the world is becoming increasingly **interdependent and service oriented**. This means that it is more and more important for all of us, no matter what our specialty, to understand how our work is related to the work of others. It also means that we must develop values and competencies that promote effective service. Yet seeing the larger picture, and developing service-oriented values, are precisely what is left out of the picture in an ever more technologically oriented education. We are cutting our own throats.

The negative effects of an over-focus on technological specialties in education are supported by the second long-term trend in education. I mean the tendency of education to **divorce what students learn from how they use what they learn**. I am talking about our long-engrained habit of assuming that it is both right and efficient to learn subjects and information in school now, but only apply that learning to real situations years from now.

Probably every one of us here today learned in this traditional way. In school, we studied our math, english, and history, passed our exams, and possibly even performed brilliantly . When we went on to college and university, we did the same thing. It was only after years of education that we began to apply the real test of learning: using everything we had learned to make a difference in some way in our society.

Most of us, at that point, had to learn about many things our school education had simply ignored. We had to learn about appreciating other people's values; about conflicts of interest; about working in and through large institutions; about the difficult process of implementing what we believed in. And so on. All of these things are not only important to being able to use knowledge effectively and responsibly. They are also part of what knowledge, or what I would call wisdom, is really about.

I believe all of us missed in school and college a kind of depth of learning that we only find when we are challenged to apply what we learn to meeting concrete and meaningful goals. Today, it is more important than ever to establish a stronger link between learning and doing, and to teach our students how to apply what they learn to making a difference. Why? Because as knowledge gets ever more fragmented, it is increasingly difficult to control the impact of what we learn, **unless we begin to think about and try to control its impact**. Again, as our global economy becomes increasingly service-oriented, it is not enough to have high tech skills. We need to know **how to use these skills to give effective service**. And we can only do this by learning and practicing service.

By separating learning from how we use our learning, higher education participates in depriving us of all the things other than abstract knowledge that a person needs to know in order to put knowledge into action. What are these things a person needs to know? They include flexibility, purposiveness, appreciation for institutions and how they function, a sense of values, a

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

commitment to a larger whole, and so on.

Our educational approach, by separating what we learn from what we do with our learning, avoids teaching our students and future citizens a sense of **moral responsibility.** Every one of us has been on some level the victim of an increasing failure of moral responsibility in our society. And lest someone in my audience think I am too high minded in asking education to teach a sense of moral responsibility, let me remind you that a sense of responsibility lies at the heart of effective interdependence in a global society. We are talking here about survival.

Examples of our nation's moral failure abound, and give ample evidence of the connection between a failure of moral sense and a crisis in service. For example, we all know that the Gulf War, with its attendant economic and military dangers, and loss of human lives, is in part due to the involvement of individual Americans in providing Iraq with military technology and arms. We know that the destruction of hundreds of viable businesses over the last few years has been partly a function of irresponsible financial investment practices. We know that increasing public discontent over medical services owes something to a failed sense of health service responsibility. We cannot simply blame the people who participate in creating these problems. We have to look further. We have to look to the **role that education has played in creating such individuals.** We have to look at **the role that education has played in failing to build a commitment to social improvement into our citizens.**

To turn things around, we have to do three things. We have

to begin making education responsible for building more of a whole citizen, rather than simply a technical specialist. We have to combine a commitment to specialization with its necessary support in a commitment to constructive interdependence. And we have to terminate the excessive isolation of learning from its application.

How do we do this? By focusing learning, including learning of highly technical skills, around carrying out constructive actions that make for positive changes in our society. By evaluating students in school not on the basis of their abstract knowledge, but rather on the basis of their ability to use that knowledge for some constructive social goal.

Let me put this another way. We should make **constructive action**, and not knowledge per se, the criterion for effective education. We should ask our educational institutions to challenge students to use what they learn, while they are in school, to make a difference. They should provide students with the opportunity to do this, through internships, programs which apply classroom learning to work environments, community projects, etc.. And they should evaluate students' learning on the basis of their ability to use classroom learning to identify needs in the outside world, and devise and carry out effective strategies for meeting those needs.

The implications of evaluating learning on the basis of constructive action are enormous. We are no longer talking about learning disciplines, for example, but about learning how to use knowledge from the disciplines to achieve social goals. This

means that the whole focus on separate disciplines, a focus which promotes fragmentation, must give way to a more comprehensive and effective way of approaching learning.

We are talking about changing the parameters of education in a very fundamental way. But the benefits, in terms of efficiency and outcome, are enormous. We began building just this kind of educational system at the College for Human Services when twenty-six years ago, we recognized the implications of the growing shift in the economy toward global interdependence. We recognized that the only way to develop effective and responsible technical knowledge in an interdependent world order was to have students use what they learned, as they learned it, to accomplish socially meaningful goals.

The College's program incorporated this approach to education and became so powerful that it quickly received both regional and national accreditation, expanded in less than twenty-six years to offering graduate as well as undergraduate degrees, and now boasts an annual student population of almost two thousand students.

At the College for Human Services, all learning is focused around carrying out constructive actions in work sites or internships. Students study knowledge from the liberal arts, accounting, statistics, psychology, and so on, but they study them in relation to a specific purpose they carry out each semester. Each semester has an overarching Purpose which involves students in carrying out a constructive action in the real world - an action which both develops the skills those students will need as

future professionals and offers concrete benefit to the institutions or individuals students work with.

Let me provide you with an example. In our business program, students combine their studies with full time jobs, and each semester enables them to apply their learning to improving their work environment in some way. One semester, for example, focuses on developing Researching and Communications abilities. In their classes, students explore aspects of statistics, organizational theory, psychology and so on, as they relate to Researching and Communications. At the same time, they analyze their work situation to discover where they can make improvements through research and communications. They then develop and implement a strategy for improving service at their work site. One student last year used the knowledge she developed in class to isolate and resolve a problem in computer coding in a major national bank. As a result, she was promoted from a clerical to a supervisory position.

As another example, our degree program in service professions focuses one semester around developing Community Liaison abilities. Effective community work requires a strong appreciation of cultural differences and values, and our curriculum includes anthropological and historical elements. One of our students became aware of the enormous value of cultural history for individual self-esteem, and used what she learned to build community linkages in a substance abuse center at which she worked. She developed what is probably the only cultural history program available to recovering substance abusers in New York

city.

These two examples will give you an understanding of a general point: when we refocus learning around carrying out meaningful, effective purposes, we give that learning breadth and scope. We ask people to consider the various possible ways they can use what they learn, and the impact of what they learn. We ask them to make reasoned and responsible choices. We ask them to see their role in a larger whole. We ask people to act as citizens of a larger society. And we give them the ability to do this.

The growing specialization and technologization of knowledge is inevitable. But that does not mean that it is also inevitable that we lose our democratic base, and lose responsibility for the impact of our own actions on society. On the contrary. We must take increasing responsibility for **seeing the role we play in a larger ever more interdependent whole**. And we must make it possible for education to show people how to **take constructive action towards meaningful social goals**. If we do not do this, we will become increasingly the victims of the eyeless dragon of technology. But if we do, as educators and political leaders, take responsibility for how we use what we learn, we will increasingly marshall our resources toward positive social ends. And we will build a responsible and effective citizenry: the kind of citizenry that all of us hope to have. Thank you.

February 21st, 1991

Copyright c 1991, Audrey C. Cohen, The College for Human Services

CRAIN'S NEW YORK BUSINESS

December 5, 1988

The schools must recognize the service economy's needs

BY AUDREY C. COHEN

EXECUTIVE FORUM

The economic and social strength of the United States has always depended on the strength of its educational system. In the 1850s the United States possessed the fastest-growing industrial economy in the world. It also had the most highly educated work force in history.

In the 1980s the picture is different. Japanese and European economies are eliminating the United States' hegemony in the world market. And the United States continues to ignore the development of its most important asset: its people. U.S. literacy rates are a shockingly low 80%, compared with those in Japan and Europe of more than 90%.

Revitalizing our educational system is an urgent national priority. Any effective revitalization must consider two crucial facts. The first is the overwhelming change taking place as we move away from an industrial and toward a service economy. The second is the alarming growth of a permanent underclass—a population without adequate skills for productive life within society.

The service economy is a high-technology economy, dominated by complex information and communication systems. Its jobs demand high literacy, greater employee flexibility and an increased ability to handle complex interpersonal relations. Good service professionals also need to know how to deliver services that meet clients' needs. Education must therefore address these issues.

Even the best traditional schools have trouble meeting these goals. They encourage passive assimilation of information, are insufficiently experiential, too individualistic and too competitive. Education in a service society has to be different.

The growth of the service economy is directly related to that of permanently unemployed and displaced workers. In the 1980s, 2.3 million workers have been displaced each year. Almost a third have been too unskilled to find new jobs. Many were the human casualties of the decline of employment in manufacturing. Others were psychologically unprepared for job retraining.

Our nation's school problems aggravate the growth of the underclass. Almost a third of our high school population drops out before graduation. The majority of that third becomes part of the permanent underclass.

Sufficiently radical educational reform can help reverse this growing crisis. Schools will have to prove to the disaffected that learning is exciting and valuable.

Our schools should integrate studies with life outside the classroom. This means organizing the curriculum around challenging experiences in the community. Every semester should have a purpose relating to service, and that purpose should inform the way subjects are taught.

For example, one semester's purpose could be improving the community, and students could focus on helping the homeless. They could offer carnivals and other events to raise funds for the homeless. And their academic curriculum would help them do this. Math skills could be used in designing shelters or in laying out the floor plan for a carnival. Social studies would give a historical perspective on changing patterns of poverty. English would come in handy for writing fliers to educate the public. In their art and drama classes, students would prepare special performances. Learning would have a meaning.

Many schools are experimenting with experiential learning. Cooperative education and work study, for example, are part of this experiment. But they are not radical enough. They do not require teachers to relate math, English and science studies directly to practical service problems. Schools should become a conscious force for social improvement, and children should be given the responsibility and right to care about their environment.

Ms. Cohen is president of the College for Human Services.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE